DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 783 FL 001 155

By-Gut, Ann F.

A Survey of Methods and Materials in French Language Programs of American Colleges and Universities.

National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Association.
Pub Date Dec 67
Note-11p.
Journal Cit-The Modern Language Journal; v51 n8 p470-480 Dec 1967
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.65
Descriptors-Audiolingual Methods, Audiolingual Skills, *College Language Programs, Educational Change, *French, Instructional Materials, Language Enrollment, Language Instruction, Language Laboratories, *Linguistics, Pattern Drills (Language), *Questionnaires, *Secondary Schools, Structural Analysis, Tables (Data), Teaching Methods, Textbook Evaluation

Results of a survey of 234 schools, placing special emphasis on the role of linguistics and the recommendations of linguists in their language programs, are presented. A questionnaire gathered information on the number of class meetings per week, the length of class time, the number of students per section, and whether class materials were linguistically oriented. Also surveyed were basic texts and oral drill and drill materials used. Conclusions are drawn about the study's design and results, and recommendations for future research are made. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 027783

*A Survey of Methods and Materials in French Language Programs of American Colleges and Universities**

From: Modern Language Journal, Vol. LI, No. 8 (December 1967).

ANN F. GUT, *Clark University*

ALTHOUGH linguists were already involved in 1940 in recommending drastic changes in language teaching methodology in this country, their views have been adopted only in varying degrees to conditions in teaching institutions and have caused some dissension between linguists and language teachers.

Because little information could be found about what is actually taking place in the language study programs in the colleges and universities of the United States today, and because it was felt that many language teachers are still either unaware of or unsure of the field of linguistics (the basic scientific study and description of language) and the vital role that its application has in successful language teaching, a study was initiated to attempt to clarify these points.

Three hundred schools were chosen at random from the list of four-year colleges in the 1966 Direrectory Issue of *PMLA* and each was questioned on the following points: 1. Number of class meetings for instruction per week. 2. Length of class. 3. Number of students per section. 4. Basis of class materials—use of modern structural linguistic analysis (phonetic-phonemic-syntactic contrasts). 5. Comments. 6. Basic texts used (first year and second year). 7. Oral practice (drill) in the language. 8. Drill materials. 9. Number of separate drill sessions per week, and their length.

The results of the study are based on 234 of the 241 replies received by February, 1967, which pertained to the French language and were considered significant. The findings are arranged according to the questions as they appear on the questionnaire and are summarized in tables. All percentages are based on the total sample of 234 schools except where expressly indicated to the contrary. In some instances, the total is higher than 234 because some schools indicated that their courses fell into more than one category. The resultant percentages, however, have been adjusted in the following manner:

$$\frac{\text{Calculated percentage on basis of 234 schools}}{\text{Total of calculated percentages}} = \frac{x}{100\%},$$

letting x = adjusted percentage on the basis of 234 schools.

Question 1. Class meetings per week.

TABLE I

CLASS MEETINGS PER WEEK

Class meetings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Number of schools	0	5	142	77	51	275
Percent	0	1.5	52	28	18.5	100

"Class Meetings" do not include time spent either in the laboratory or in separate drill practice. Where contact hours in the language differ for first and second year courses, the usual practice is for first year classes to meet more often per week than the second year classes. Individual variations occur where class instruction time depends on the amount of required laboratory assignments, the number of credit hours for the course, or where the class is of a tutorial nature.

* The study herein described was initiated as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education under the title "Some Consideration of Linguistics in Foreign Language Programs in Colleges and Universities of the United States with Special Reference to French.

The author is particularly indebted to Dr. J. Richard Reid, Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages at Clark University, whose sustained interest and constructive discussions helped make the entire study possible. The author is also indebted to Dr. Joseph C. Bentley, Acting Chairman of the Department of Education, who read the thesis in rough form.

FL 001 155

Question 2. Length of class.

Of the twenty schools that fall into the category "other," eight schools, or 3 percent, have 55 minute classes, and the remaining twelve schools or 5 percent have classes that vary from 58 minutes to 80 minutes.

Question 1 in relation to question 2. Total class time per week (class meetings per week times length of class).

Those schools that fall into the category "other" represent a mean of 216 minutes of total class instruction per week.

Question 3. Approximate number of students per section.

Those schools indicating "other" fall into two categories of which sixteen indicated less than twenty students per section and two indicated seventy-five students or more per section.

It is of interest to note that Georgetown University, which indicated classes of seventy-five students, specifically pointed out that these large classes are broken up into groups of ten for language practice three times a week. They also indicated six hours of laboratory practice per week, in addition.

Question 4. Are class materials clearly based on modern structural linguistic analysis (phonetic-phonemic-syntactic contrasts)?

In responding to this question some schools indicated that first and second year courses are not treated in the same manner and in some cases it seems to depend upon the individual instructors involved. One school indicated uncertainty whether to check "no" or "partially," but the comment (question 5) was such that a clear answer of no would have been justified.

Although eighty schools replied affirmatively to this question, eleven of these same schools indicated that in addition they have

TABLE IIA

LENGTH OF CLASS IN MINUTES

Class time	30	45	50	Other	Total
Number of schools	0	3	213	20	236
Percent	0	1	91	8	100

TABLE II B

TOTAL CLASS TIME PER WEEK IN MINUTES

Class time	100	150	200	250	350	Other	Total
Number of schools	3	134	70	42	3	20	272
Percent	1	49	26	15	1	8	100

TABLE III

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER SECTION

No. of students	20	25	30	40	50	Other	Total
Number of schools	110	48	48	6	2	18	232
Percent	47	21	21	3	1	7	100

TABLE IV

CLASS MATERIALS BASED ON MODERN STRUCTURAL LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

Response	Yes	No	Partially	Unsure	Not indicated	Total
Number of schools	80	30	122	8	9	249
Percent	32	12	49	3	4	100

courses that are based only partially on the use of such materials. A response of "partially," therefore, includes schools that are using materials based on modern structural linguistic analysis for some courses only, and others which are only partially using such materials for all courses.

Question 5. Comments (in relation to class materials).

Of those schools reporting that their class materials are clearly based on modern structural linguistic analysis, it is doubtful that some understood the question at all. For example, one comment was made to the effect that the problem is to find enough time to do the "contrast" and suggests postponing the "analysis" to the second level. The very essence of applying modern linguistic analysis is exactly that of making the most efficient use of time. The student is not expected to make the contrasts or analyses himself—that is in the realm of the linguist who then makes it possible to prepare the materials with these points already synthesized, to the end that both the teaching and learning of language skills are facilitated.

Another remark that appears to denote a common difficulty is that the text presently used in beginning classes is entirely "direct method," but since there is so little time in class, some explanations are made in English (though kept to a minimum). This respondent suggests a change of text "since it contains too much to cover in a class meeting three times a week with only one laboratory per week." (One possible solution to the problem raised here is precisely the use of small drill groups which would "cover" the required material and offer the student invaluable practice in using the language. This, of course, can present difficulties in scheduling, but those schools which believe in these methods have been able to surmount these difficulties. For example, Clark University and Georgetown University specifically mention the use of the small drill session—of not more than 10 students—for the purpose of individual language practice which cannot, of necessity, take place in the large classroom.

Frequently the comment refers to the text being used and this will be discussed in relation to question 6. Several schools noted that they intend to change their methods and materials to a more linguistically oriented approach by 1967–68. There were also several responses denoting regret that good intermediate level materials and texts presented on a structural linguistic basis are not yet available.

Of those schools that answered a clear "no" to the fourth question, one sometimes detects an almost belligerent attitude. "We definitely do not use structural linguistic methods" was one response, " . . . but rather the direct audio-visual method, as used at the Alliance Française of Paris." This particular respondent explained even further that at his school they "avoid busywork of makeshift audio-lingual method and carefully integrate both class and laboratory work audio-visually."

Another commented that in his opinion the modern scientific approach is entirely unnecessary in first and second year courses. Since these are the courses where language *qua* language is usually taught and where the "scientific approach" is specifically applicable, this respondent is clearly in disagreement with most professional linguists.

Other colleges reported the use or non-use of linguistic materials according to the texts being used. One school reported that its text does not provide for any contrastive analysis of English and French. However, this school offers a special course entitled "The Structure of French" devoted entirely to the contrastive analysis of the two languages. (It should be kept in mind that the question concerns not the teaching of linguistics, but the teaching of a foreign language with materials that are linguistically oriented.)

Another commented that "the books do not give it this way entirely, . . . I myself let them [the students] deduce the grammar (what there is) by having them observe and memorize."

One questionnaire that was not checked as to materials being used, did, however, contain the comment that their classes do *not* have "linguistic small drill groups."

Many of those who checked "partially" appeared to be quite candid, but the responses varied from quite certain and knowledgeable to very uncertain and confused as to the significance of linguistics in language teaching.

Some of the more meaningful comments were as follows: 1. We try to be as up to date in method as possible. This involves re-education of teachers as well as reorganization of materials. 2. Our second year text is primarily traditional in its orientation, although some of the drills in the accompanying workbook show the influence of contemporary methods. Note that reading (in complete books of contemporary authors) occupies over half the time in the second year. 3. We have several people teaching French; some are better trained in linguistics than others. 4. Clearly based on as many approaches as we can base them. Students are taught to speak, hear and understand, but they are literate, as well. 5. Publishers of texts are now aware of the importance of the structural approach—but seem to be afraid of going all the way. They fear the results of such a drastic and sudden change in the appearance of the format, etc. and too, many, many teachers are yet almost totally ignorant of what this [linguistics] is, and are therefore opposed to it. 6. We are presently undergoing sweeping curriculum reforms and reevaluating language objectives for these very courses. 7. We are presently in a transitional stage, moving in the direction of linguistically oriented materials. 8. Instructors are aware—but systematic application or otherwise depends on the individual teacher.

Typical of the comments which indicate a lack of appreciation for linguistic materials are the following: 1. We try to use the modern approach and the traditional, too. We like French very much. 2. Personally, I loathe the current linguistic jargon! 3. We do not use the foreign language exclusively; most times we give instructions and explanations in English.[1]

Many of the comments suggested that the methods and materials varied with the individual teachers and texts. Several schools indicated that their teachers have prepared and are using their own texts—some of which are due to be published in 1967.

Of those responses that indicated "unsure" to question 4, the following comment is probably the most frank if not the most typical: "Having heard a number of papers on the so-called 'linguistic' approach, I'm still not sure if I know what it means."

Question 6. Basic text used. (Only those texts being used by more than 10 percent of the schools are considered in Tables V A and V B).

The basic texts being used in the first year courses where one text suffices are less diverse than those in the second year courses where both review grammars and readers are in use. Very often more than one basic text is used in

[1] This respondent apparently equates linguistic materials with exclusive use of the foreign language.

TABLE V A

FIRST YEAR TEXTBOOKS

Author	Title	No. of schools	Percent use
Harris-Lévêque	*Basic Conversational French*	59	25
Lenard	*Parole et Pensée*	29	12
Brown	*French: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing*	28	12

TABLE V B

SECOND YEAR TEXTBOOKS

Author	Title	No. of schools	Percent use
Harris-Lévêque	*Intermediate Conversational French*	33	14
Mondelli-François	*French Conversational Review Grammar*	32	14

the intermediate courses. These include various review grammars of both a conversational and literary style as well as several readers with grammatical exercises and drill materials. The intermediate courses also include texts that are principally aimed at introducing French literature and culture.

Aside from the five texts listed in Tables V A and B, the use of all other texts is sporadic, with many books being used by only one school. Several schools indicated a change of text contemplated for 1967–68.

Question 4 in relation to question 6. Are class materials clearly based on modern structural linguistic analysis in reference to the basic texts being used? (Only those texts being used by more than 10 percent of the schools are considered in Table VI.)

It is of interest to note that numerous responses to question 4 referred to the texts being used as verification that materials either are or are not based on modern structural linguistic analysis. What makes this confusing, however, is that some teachers judge the same texts quite differently with respect to their interpretation of linguistic orientation. It was not at all unusual to have the remark "see texts for verification" following either a positive or negative response to question 4—when in fact the same texts are being used.

In general, if the text is linguistically oriented, the classes tend to follow the text and therefore use (even if inadvertently) linguistic materials and methods. However, if the text is more traditional in its exposition, it is less general for the teacher to make the changes or modifications necessary for the preparation of linguistic materials. In some cases, however, where the questionnaire was checked to indicate either positive or partial use of materials and methods based on modern structural linguistic analysis and where the texts being used might not otherwise warrant such a conclusion, comments were added to the effect that the teachers do supplement the material in the basic text with drills, phonetic material, etc.

One school commented that its first-year text (Brown) is based to a large extent, if somewhat unsystematically, on linguistic principles, although its second year text is primarily traditional in its orientation. This remark was similar to eight others where Brown is being used in the first year course.

Question 5 in relation to question 6. Comments concerning texts being used.

There was one comment that "so far second year texts are less well adapted to structural linguistic analysis without loss of content (vocabulary and advanced structures)—which constitutes the major weakness of conversational review texts." There were several comments to the effect that while the texts used are not "clearly" based on modern structural linguistic analysis, insofar as they are, it is attempted to use these methods. Another comment was that "our texts are not completely satisfactory from this standpoint, but they have the advantage of a kind of middle-of-the-road approach of which I and most of my colleagues approve."

The following comment is typical of the teacher who seems unsure as to what actually constitutes the use of linguistics in language teaching and learning: If you are familiar with the texts [in this case Fraser, Squair and Parker:

TABLE VI

CLASS MATERIALS BASED ON LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

Text	Yes	No	Partially	Unsure	Not checked
Brown	14	0	13	0	1
Harris-Lévêque	17	4	34	1	3
Lenard	9	4	15	1	0
Harris-Lévêque	7	1	22	1	2
Mondelli-François	10	4	16	1	1

Foundation Course in French and Mondelli-François: *French Conversational Review Grammar*] you may know the answer to 4. I have students learn all (I.P.A.) phonetic symbols presented in Fraser and Squair because all their vocabulary words are accompanied by phonetic transcription. Outside of that, we do what oral recitation we have time for, and that's all. Since Mondelli-François has no phonetics we do nothing phonetically the second year. In order to get the text material finished by the end of the year (along with some work in a reading text) it is impossible for me to do any oral training.

Question 7. How do students obtain oral practice (drill) in the language?

It had been anticipated that most schools would be using part of regular class time to allow the students to obtain oral practice (drill) in the language, and this proved to be the case. It is of interest, however, that an equal number of schools have some sort of language laboratory for this purpose, also. While most schools appear to have a language laboratory with separate booths, several schools indicated the use of a tape recorder in the library listening room, or some other portable means of using a tape and headset on an individual basis. Language laboratory is not required in all schools and varies considerably from school to school as to the length and number of periods per week. For oral practice some schools apparently divide their classes into groups during class instruction hours.

Two schools clearly indicated that their laboratory time is also used for "live-drill" practice and one school indicated that it has separate drill sessions with a native graduate assistant for all students with either no other previous language training or any "D" grade on an exam.

Twenty-four schools reported that they have separate drill sessions in groups of ten students or less which meet for oral practice apart from regular class time. Of these, only one school indicated that drill practice does not also take place during part of class time. Four of these twenty-four schools do not have a language laboratory, although one school indicated that its language laboratory is now being constructed.

Thirteen schools indicated separate drill sessions in groups of more than ten students. Of these schools, three do not use part of class time for oral practice, and two do not presently have a language laboratory, although one school anticipated having a laboratory installed in 1967.

One comment which seems to denote a misconception of linguistic principles in the use of pattern drills was to the effect that the class is conducted entirely in French and that "oral work (drill if you wish) is based on the question/answer pattern. The exercises in the book are to be done at home so that no precious class time is wasted on such matters."

In the opinion of the writer, this respondent seems to be unconcerned with the oral habits of his students—either with the pronunciation, intonation and stress which the student cannot possibly correct by himself without a model to imitate—or with the spontaneity of correct grammatical pattern which cannot be drilled by writing exercises. There were various possibilities suggested as "other" means of oral practice apart from a portion of regular class time, drill sessions and language laboratory. Some schools have weekly conversational practice

TABLE VII

TYPE OF ORAL PRACTICE (DRILL) IN THE LANGUAGE

	Part of class time	Separate drill groups		Lang. lab.	Student devices	Other
		(10 or less)	(more than 10)			
Number of schools	211	24[1]	13[1]	211[2]	29	31
Percent of schools	90	10	5.5	90	12	13

[1] One school indicated that it has separate drill groups of both fewer than and more than ten students. A total of thirty-six schools offer separate drill sessions.

[2] Four additional schools indicated that their language laboratories were to be installed in 1967.

available with a resident native speaker, either in informal gatherings, or at a so-called "language table," or in a language residence on campus.

Other schools provide for oral practice in language clubs or by requiring individual reports or class recitations. In only one case, is it left *entirely* to the student to devise his own means—if any—of oral practice. Some schools assign homework in the language lab as a means of encouraging oral practice in the language and for those schools which have no formally installed language laboratory there are often assignments to listen to tapes in the library or at home.

Question 8. Drill materials.

TABLE VIII A

DRILL MATERIALS

	Directly from text	Modified by teacher	Supplemented by teacher	Composed entirely by teacher
Number of schools	203	118	142	24
Percent of schools	87	50	60	10

TABLE VIII B

ORIGINS OF DRILL MATERIALS IN DETAIL

	Number of schools	Percent of schools
Taken directly from text	44	19
Directly and modified	33	14
Directly and supplemented	52	22
Directly and composed	1	0.4
Modified	6	3
Modified and supplemented	8	3
Modified and composed	0	0
Supplemented	7	3
Supplemented and composed	0	0
Composed	3	1
Composed and directly from text	1	0.4
Directly, modified and supplemented	55	24
Directly, modified and composed	1	0.4
Directly, supplemented and composed	1	0.4
Modified, supplemented and composed	2	0.9
Directly, modified, supplemented and composed	14	6
Varies	1	0.4
Not checked	4	1.7
No drills	1	0.4
Total	234	100.0

Although most of the schools indicate that they are using drills taken directly from the texts (and this probably means that they are using the accompanying tapes in their laboratory drills) a substantial proportion of the schools are in addition either modifying these drills or supplementing them; considerably fewer schools are exclusively using drills composed by their own staff. (See Table VIII B.)

In two schools, however, drills taken directly from the text are used only in first year courses, and the staffs devise their own drill materials for the second year courses. These drill materials are used in conjunction with a sequence of readers without any specific grammar text as such.

There does not appear to be any particular relation between the texts being used and the fact that drills are being entirely composed by the staff. It seems, rather, to be an individual practice on the part of the particular staff involved. More than half of the schools that indicated that they write their own drills also indicated that they use drills taken directly from the text as well as modifying and supplementing these drills. Usually the material used depends on the grammar text, the reading text, the class, and the teacher, all in conjunction one with the other.

Of the five most popular texts mentioned, only the Brown book has drills that the writer considers adequate to be used directly from the text for the purpose of separate drill sessions. Most books give examples of drills that *can* be used, but invariably they are not complete enough or diverse enough to offer ample opportunity for the amount of practice necessary if the student is to establish oral habits in the language.

By the same token, the prepared tapes for language laboratory that currently accompany most texts must often be edited, and modified or supplemented. Too often this is caused by

the fact that the person (or persons) reading the material for the tapes while maintaining proper intonation and stress patterns in full sentences, is not competent in maintaining these patterns for single words. It is not at all unusual to have taped cues given in an intonation such that repetition of the cue phrase as it was stated in the cue—when placed in its slot in the complete sentence context—will either change the meaning of the sentence or actually cause an error (by inserting into the wrong slot in the sentence). Other normal pitfalls of tapes are poor timing of pauses, and failure to give adequate examples to establish the pattern being practiced. It is important to allow enough time—but not too much—for the student to respond before hearing the confirmation, and it is extremely important to hear a variety of voices and expressions, to avoid monotony and drowsiness.

Some of the comments explaining responses to question 8 include the two following remarks which clearly show the diversity of opinion among teachers today, concerning some of the basic philosophy of linguistic principles in language teaching: "Texts which are still in use and are not geared toward the linguistic approach to language teaching are being supplemented by materials presented by the teacher . . . [including pattern drills, etc.]". "Oral drills are based on the text—yet not taken from the book. Our instructors are encouraged to stay away from such drills as pattern sentences and similar rubbish."

Question 9. If separate drill sessions are used: Number of drills per week and length of drills. (Tables IX A and B are based on a total of 36 schools which indicated separate drill sessions.)

It was sometimes difficult to interpret whether or not question 7 concerning separate drill sessions (in groups of less than ten or more than ten) was answered accurately, in view of the fact that four schools each failed to indicate either the number of drills per week or the length of the drills. In two cases it was impossible to determine whether these separate drill sessions were actually "live drills" as opposed to language laboratory drills. Five of the schools which indicated separate drill sessions currently have no language laboratory facilities. Of these, four indicated meeting in groups of ten or less for drill practice.

TABLE IX A

NUMBER OF SEPARATE DRILL SESSIONS PER WEEK

Drills per week	1	2	3	Not indicated	Total
Number of schools	10	14	9	4	37[1]
Percent	17	38	24	11	100

[1] One school indicated that it has either one or two drill sessions per week.

Seventeen of the twenty-four schools reporting separate small drill groups meet either two or three times per week for practice sessions. In addition, three other schools reported small drill groups, but they fall into the category of schools that failed to report either the number or else the length of these drills.

Of the total sample, fifteen percent offer separate sessions for drill practice in the language. Total drill practice time varies from 15 minutes to 150 minutes per week in these schools (seventy-eight percent offer between 50 and 150 minutes) exclusive of both class instruction and laboratory practice.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has described certain features of the French language teaching programs as they

TABLE IX B

LENGTH OF SEPARATE DRILL SESSION IN MINUTES

Length of drill	15	20	25	30	45	50	55	Not indicated	Total
Number of schools	1	1	1	12[1]	4[1]	14[1]	1	4	38[1]
Percent	3	3	3	31	10	37	3	10	100

[1] One school indicated drills of 30–45 minutes in length and one school indicated drills of 30–50 minutes in length. (The latter is the same school referred to in footnote 1 of Table IX A.)

currently exist in colleges and universities of the United States with special consideration to the place of linguistics and the recommendations of linguists.

A related problem not investigated here is that there is an equal need among linguists to understand the teaching problems in the classroom, together with the administrative problems such as scheduling, space, and staff. This becomes especially apparent if all language classes are to be split into small groups for oral practice in the language, under the guidance of an instructor, to help establish habits of structure, sound, and vocabulary.

The results of the questionnaires support the opinion that there exists a need among language teachers to understand more fully scientific study of language with all its implications for the field of language teaching.

However, the most pressing problem seems to be one of good textual materials which would help enormously both the teacher and the learner from the very outset, not only because they are linguistically sound, but also because they contain interesting and culturally informative material together with an attractive format. It appears that most teachers (and probably the vast majority of students) are dependent upon language texts for the presentation and effective manner of explanation of language.

When good linguistic materials are available, the next problem that presents itself is sufficient and effective drill in the language. This entails not only practicing the sounds and structures that are being taught in the classroom but also practicing these elements until the student responses are both automatic and correct— grammatically, phonologically, and rhythmically. Language laboratories that are properly and sufficiently monitored and "live drill" with an instructor who has a native or near-native accent are both needed to help the student develop normal use of the language so that he can adequately express himself and understand others. He will thereby more readily learn to understand the written language and to express himself in it. Parallel to and to a degree inherent in the learning of these skills will be the introduction to the culture of the people represented by the language being learned.

Another problem is one of time—of adequate contact with the language in order to develop all the habits necessary for the desired use of the language as described above.

Not to be overlooked is the problem in second year (intermediate) college language programs caused by the variety of backgrounds from high school preparation. It is not at all unusual to find students mixed together in a second year college language course who have had one, two, three or even four years of previous study in the language. This compounds the teaching problem since some of these students have already well-established but poor habits in the language and others are simply antagonistic toward the language. This antagonism is especially evident in the case of those, who, in spite of several years of high school preparation, do not qualify for placement into a more advanced course. Furthermore, the problem of boredom must be prevented for the student who is well grounded in the language after only one or two years of preparation.

The basic conclusion that this writer draws from the present study is that too many college and university programs are not making extensive enough (and in some cases, not any) use of linguistically oriented materials and of the methods which are an outgrowth of this scientific study of language. This in turn means that secondary school programs will continue to remain at least a generation behind in regard to methods and materials used in their language classes unless secondary school teachers are to be trained beyond the college level.

Aside from the lack of materials, there is evidence of a negative attitude on the part of some professors toward linguistics in general, which constitutes a serious handicap to any changes or advances in language teaching methodology.

The writer attributes this attitude to a lack of knowledge or appreciation of linguistic principles and of their place in language teaching. Yet, it would seem that the scientific study of language is an essential element in making advances in the art of language teaching. A lack of linguistic sophistication in turn points

up a need either to include courses in linguistics on a college level for future language teachers, or else to require *all* teachers of languages to have at least one additional year of linguistic training before going into the profession. (Certainly this training should be mandatory for all college language teachers, since it is they who will be training future secondary school teachers.)

Linguists on the other hand should be more cautious in their claims of simplified language learning and the time involved for proficiency in this skill. Certainly there is an efficient method for teaching any skill but no substitute can replace practice and study both of which require time and patience.

There is hope in the fact that some of the schools questioned noted dissatisfaction with the present materials, and as more linguistically oriented materials become available, it is expected that they will find increasing use.

From the fact that at least 50 percent of the schools are both modifying and supplementing the drill materials in texts, one can also conclude that the present available texts do not in general contain enough or adequate drill materials for the needs of the students.

Ninety percent of the schools reported using class instruction time for drills, but where the drills were extensive enough so that patterns could be learned, comments were included to the effect that there was not enough time left for adequate class instruction and vice versa. Therefore, although only 10 percent of the schools have separate drill practice in groups of ten students or less (an additional 5 percent meet in groups larger than ten), it does not seem unreasonable to expect that more colleges will adopt this practice.

The language laboratory is already well established, as evidenced by its use in 90 percent of the schools.

Another encouraging observation is that several of the schools whose questionnaires noted "unsure" as to the linguistic basis of class materials also contained a comment expressing the desire for more information about linguistic analysis and the study of linguistics in general. Eighty-one percent of the schools, however, acknowledged some degree of impact of linguistic theory on their teaching methods and materials.

Limitations of This Study

Since the instrument of this study was limited to a one page questionnaire, there are many questions that still remain to be asked. In addition, since the questionnaire was sent to the individual chairman of each college language program, one is dependent upon the subjective evaluation of each professor. It would have been considerably more effective if one person or group could have personally observed these programs and evaluated them on the basis of consistent standards. Also, because of the way in which some of the questions were answered—or not answered—the writer was forced to decide whether the information given for one question was actually valid on the basis of information given—or not given—in a related question; e.g., some schools indicated separate drill sessions in question 7, but failed to answer question 9 in regard to the number and length of drills per week. Other schools answered question 9 although they had not indicated separate drill sessions in question 7. In some cases, it was made clear that the information in question 9 actually referred to laboratory practice, and not to separate drill sessions.

First and second year courses were treated simultaneously in this study, although in practice they often differ as to contact hours, size of class, types of oral practice, and materials. These differences are taken into account wherever possible, but it was not always clear in the response.

Information is lacking on the actual type of drilling that takes place both in the classroom and in the drill session, as well as on the manner of presentation and the authenticity of the model.

Concerning laboratory practices, there is no information on 1) the number of hours; 2) the types of drill; 3) the equipment used; 4) whether the student is monitored and corrected; 5) whether there is play-back; and 6) whether the laboratory practice, itself, is compulsory.

Although the questionnaire asked for "class meetings per week" meaning class meetings for instruction, some respondents included labora-

tory time in this category also, which led to uncertainties and doubtless some inaccuracies in interpreting the results. It was also difficult to interpret information concerning the materials contained in textbooks being used, since the publication dates were omitted, and it was not clear whether revised editions were in use.

Suggestions for Future Research

It would be of interest to follow up various aspects of this study particularly in regard to the class materials. Texts are beginning to appear which are more linguistically oriented than in the past. To what extent will they be accepted and what coordinate changes will they bring about in the presentation of the language and in the attitude of the instructors toward linguistics?

Also, as more teachers take advantage of NDEA summer institutes where the study of linguistics is stressed, one can expect continuing changes in the profession of language teaching—and in the content of teacher training courses for the preparation of more professional language teachers.

There is no information on credit-hours in this study. Can one expect up to eight hours of class per week (including instruction, drill and laboratory) for only three credits?

And perhaps the most important question that is left unanswered is that of the final results. Which schools using what materials and methods yield the optimum student success in terms of the over-all use and understanding of the language? Literature and culture are not here considered since this study concerned only first and second year courses.

Published by

The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations

Copyright ©, 1968 by *The Modern Language Journal*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY The Modern Language Journal

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."